

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 17 2008

REMARKS

Summary of Telephone Examiner/Attorney Interview 04/08/2008.

Applicants thank Examiner for the interview granted to their attorney, Janis E. Clements, on April 8, 2008. In that interview, Applicants' attorney discussed with Examiner our intention of amending the claims in order to distinguish the invention from the cited art. One distinction of the present invention, as will be set forth in greater detail in the subsequent argument, is that the invention comprises means for isolating data in a displayed received document by highlighting one or more headings of the document's table of contents, and enabling a user to print and/or copy the data associated with the highlighted one or more headings of the table of contents. On the other hand, the MS-Office03 reference does not disclose being able to select a heading and print or copy the associated data for the selected heading, as claimed.

Response to Claims Rejections

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b). Claims 1, 7, and 13 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, and 18 are amended herein. The rejection of claims 1-18 as being unpatentable under 35 USC §102(b) is respectfully traversed.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action objected to the specification, and particularly to the abstract, since the abstract exceeded 150 words in length. The abstract has been amended herein and is currently less than 150 words in length, and within the range of 50 to 150 words in length. The specification is now patentable over the objections to the specification.

Rejections under 35 USC §112

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 7, and 13 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, independent claims 1, 7, and 13 recited "means for isolating data in a displayed received document *using divider tags*" (*emphasis added*). Admittedly, the specification does not specifically disclose "divider tags". Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended to remove any reference to "divider tags", and are now patentable over the §112 rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 7 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as having insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation of "said receiving station". Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to instead recite "said receiving display station", and are now patentable over the §112 rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 17 and 18 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as having insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "underlying Web document." Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 17 and 18 have been amended to recite "Web document", removing the word "underlying" from each of these claims. Therefore, claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 17 and 18 are now patentable over the §112 rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 7, and 13 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the specification does not disclose "divider tags". Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, and 13 to remove the words "divider tags" from claims 1, 7, and 13, and have clarified within independent claims 1, 7, and 13 "the means for isolating data in a displayed received document *by highlighting one or more headings of the document's table of contents*; means enabling a user to print the data *associated with the highlighted one or more headings of the table of contents*; and means for copying said designated data *associated with the highlighted one or more headings of the table of contents*." Support for these claim amendments is found at page 8, lines 9-25, and page 10, lines 9-12 of the specification. Since claims 1, 7, and 13 more clearly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, claims 1, 7, and 13 are patentable over the §112 rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 3 (sic), 9, and 15 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, since the claims recite "said documents are E-mail documents" and the Examiner is not sure if the claim is referencing the "received documents" or "secondary document". Claims 3, 9, and 15 have been amended to recite "said network documents", and are now patentable over the §112 rejection.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 USC 102(b) over NPL: "Microsoft Office Professional Edition 2003" (MS-Office03).

Responsive to the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1, 7, and 13, amended claim 1 is reproduced below (claims 7 and 13 are similar to claim 1, but claim 7 is written in method form, and claim 13 is written in the form of a computer program having code recorded on a computer readable medium):

1. (Currently Amended) In a communication network with user access via a plurality of data processor controlled interactive receiving display stations for displaying received documents of at least one display page containing formatted text and image data, and available from sources on the network, a system for eliminating extraneous displayable data from received documents comprising:

network interactive browser means associated with each of said receiving display stations for accessing said received documents from the network and displaying said documents at said receiving display stations;

said network browser means further including:

means for isolating data in a displayed received document by highlighting one or more headings of the document's table of contents using divider tags;

means enabling a user to print the isolated data associated with the highlighted one or more headings of the table of contents designated by a user; and

means for copying said designated data associated with the highlighted one or more headings of the table of contents to create a secondary document having a document format structure independent of a format structure of the received document.

While MS-Office03 discloses isolating data in a displayed received document, enabling a user to print the isolated data designated by a user, and copying the designated data to create a secondary document having a document format structure independent of a format structure of the received document, the claimed invention allows a user to highlight one or more *headings* of a document's table of contents and print or copy *only the data associated with the selected one or more headings of the table of contents*. The prior art, MS-Office03, only allows a user to print the actual selected or highlighted data from a document. The claimed invention allows a user to print an entire section of a document

by only highlighting the heading associated with that section and not highlighting the entire section. Similarly, the claimed invention allows a user to copy an entire section of a document by only highlighting a heading associated with the desired section to be copied, and not requiring the user to highlight the entire section to cut and paste to a secondary document, as in the cited art.

MS-Office fails to disclose *"isolating data in a displayed received document by highlighting one or more headings of the document's table of contents; enabling a user to print the data associated with the highlighted one or more headings of the table of contents; and copying said designated data associated with the highlighted one or more headings of the table of contents to create a secondary document having a document format structure independent of a format structure of the received document."* The application explains on page 8, lines 9-25, how the invention may be used to provide an implementation for isolating desired data for printing only the requested data from a lengthy document. The example described in the application is of a lengthy document containing a table of contents or headings. In the example, the lengthy document is an instruction manual and the user only wants to print an important portion of the document which describes how to assemble the apparatus for which it relates. The user does not want to print the entire document. The user highlights or clicks on the desired chapter or heading of the document's table of contents, and a pop-up menu is provided to the user. The user can select "Print" from the menu, and the chapter or heading indicated will be printed without printing the entire document. The user could also extract and copy the portion into a separate document. Also, on page 10, lines 9-12 of the application, the steps of enabling a user to selectively highlight or otherwise designate portions of data for printing and/or copying into storage is explained. A user can simply highlight a desired chapter or heading from a table of contents in a document, right click on the mouse, and select "Print" from a pop-up menu. The user is enabled to print the data stored independent of the original received E-mail, Web document, or other document.

Applicants respectfully disagree that the reference MS-Office03, discloses the Applicant's invention of *"isolating data in a displayed received document by highlighting one or more headings of the document's table of contents", "enabling a user to print the data associated with the highlighted one or more headings of the table of contents", or "copying said designated data associated with the highlighted one or more headings of the table of contents to create a secondary document having a document format structure independent of a format structure of the received document."*

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 17 2008

Applicants therefore feel independent claims 1, 7 and 13 are patentable over 35 USC §102.

Claims 2-6 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1. Applicants feel claim 1 is patentable under 35 USC §102 in its amended form, therefore claims 2-6 are patentable under 35 USC §102. Similarly, claims 8-12 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 7, and are thought to be patentable under 35 USC §102. Claims 14-18 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 13, and are thought to be patentable under 35 USC §102. Applicants respectfully request an allowance.

No Admission

Applicant's decision not to argue each of the dependent claims separately is not an admission that the subject matter of those claims is disclosed or suggested by the applied art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and the allowance of the current pending claims are respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels that the pending claims could be allowed with minor changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss an Examiner's Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Janis E. Clements

Reg. No. 45,407

Customer No. 000046242

3112 Lomita Drive
Austin, Texas 78738
(512)970-1639 (telephone)
(512)263-9756 (facsimile)